

REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Various claims are amended.

New claims 16-24 are added.

Support for the claim amendments and new claims is found, for example, in FIGS. 7A and 7B, and the corresponding disclosure on page 20, lines 3-23, of the present application.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that claims 1-5 and 7-24 are currently pending.

II. NEW MATTER OBJECTIONS UNDER 35 U.S.C. 132(a)

The claims are amended to overcome the objection.

III. CLAIMS 1 – 5 AND 7 – 15 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH AS FAILING TO COMPLY WITH THE WRITTEN DESCRIPTION REQUIREMENT

The claims are amended to overcome the rejection.

IV. CLAIMS 1 – 5 AND 7 – 15 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 112, FIRST PARAGRAPH AS FAILING TO COMPLY WITH THE ENABLEMENT REQUIREMENT

The claims are amended to overcome the rejection.

V. CLAIMS 1 – 5 AND 7 – 15 ARE OBJECTED TO BECAUSE OF INFORMALITIES

The claims are amended to overcome the objection.

VI. CLAIMS 1, 5, AND 7-15 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SHIRASAKI (U.S. 5,930,045) IN VIEW OF SPILLER ET AL. (U.S. 6,134,049) AND OKUMURA ET AL. (U.S. 5,969,902)

Claim 1 is amended to recite a light input portion on the first surface of the substrate, and that light enters the substrate through the light input portion to be reflected between the first and second multi-layer films. Claim 1 is also amended to recite that the fixing material does not block the light from entering the substrate through the light input portion. Somewhat similar amendments are made to various other claims. Moreover, the new claims include somewhat similar features.

Support for the claim amendments is found, for example, in FIGS. 7A and 7B, and the corresponding disclosure on page 20, lines 3-23, of the present application.

For example, as can be seen in FIGS. 7A and 7B, the fixing material 20 does not block the light from entering the substrate 13 through the light input portion 12. See also the disclosure on page 20, lines 3-23, which indicates that, even if the fixing material 20 was opaque, there would be no problems with the optical characteristic of the device.

None of the references, taken individual or in combination, discloses or suggests the features as recited in the amended claim 1.

The above comments are directed to claim 1. However, it is respectfully submitted that the comments would be helpful in understanding various differences of various other claims over the cited references.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VII. CLAIMS 1 – 4 ARE REJECTED UNDER 35 U.S.C. 103(a) AS BEING UNPATENTABLE OVER SHIRASAKI (U.S. 5,930,045) IN VIEW OF FUJII ET AL. (U.S. 5,424,876) AND OKUMURA ET AL. (U.S. 5,969,902)

The comments in Section VI, above, also apply here, where appropriate.

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the rejection is overcome.

VIII. CONCLUSION

In view of the above, it is respectfully submitted that the application is in condition for allowance, and a Notice of allowance is earnestly solicited.

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this response, please charge such fees to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,
STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: January 5, 2007 ^{PIK}

By: Paul I. Kravetz
Paul I. Kravetz
Registration No. 35,230

1201 New York Ave, N.W., Suite 700
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501